



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,891	12/29/2004	Takashi Yamamizu	1141/73452	2719
23432	7590	11/17/2006	EXAMINER	
COOPER & DUNHAM, LLP 1185 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 10036			VAUGHN, MEGANN E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2859	

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/519,891	<b>Applicant(s)</b> YAMAMIZU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Megann E. Vaughn	<b>Art Unit</b> 2859	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 August 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-3 and 5-11 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>8/30/2006</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 2, 5-7, and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takekoshi et al (US 6215308) in view of Minas et al (US 2002/0145426) in view of Kaufman et al (US 5517121).

Regarding claims 1, 2, 6, and 9, Takekoshi et al discloses in figure 1, a MRI apparatus comprising:

a gantry including a pair of upper magnet (70) and lower magnet (40) arranged oppositely and concentrically in a vertical direction, sandwiching a measurement space into which an object to be examined is inserted and a pair of columns (62, 64) supporting the upper magnet installed over the outer parts of the upper magnet and the lower magnet in the vertical direction (column 2, lines 60-67 to column 3, line 1), and

a bed (10) on which the object is placed, including (i) a bed base (14) and (ii) a top plate (12) inserted into the measurement space (column 3, lines 21-23), and the top plate is moved along a longitudinal and a transverse direction of the bed base (column 3, lines 11-13).

Takekoshi et al does not disclose that the pair of columns is oppositely arranged with respect to a central axis of the upper and lower magnet, and a cross sectional area of one column of the pair of columns is made smaller than that of the other.

Minas et al discloses in figure 10, a MRI apparatus comprising an upper and lower magnet pair with a pair of columns (94, 96), wherein the pair of columns is oppositely arranged with respect to a central axis of the upper and lower magnet (paragraph [0014], lines 4-6, paragraph [0034], lines 6-8), and a cross sectional area of one column (94) of the pair of columns is made  $1/2$  or smaller of that of the other column (Minas et al., paragraph [0015], lines 6-8, Fig 10).

Regarding claim 9, Minas et al. further teach that the side surface of the column with a large cross sectional area (96) facing the magnet center is tapered with its top pursed toward an end (see Fig 10).

Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to arrange the columns, disclosed by Takekoshi et al, and to make one of the columns smaller than the other while the larger one is tapered in the direction of the center of the magnet as taught by Minas et al in order to accommodate different types of loading, and to create a high degree of openness in order to improve patient comfort and accessibility (paragraphs [0014]-[0016]), respectively.

The combination of Takekoshi et al and Minas et al does not disclose that the bed base is movable along the periphery of the gantry.

Kaufman et al discloses in figures 3a, 3b, 4a, and 4b an MRI system with side-access within a two-column main magnet wherein the bed/patient transport mechanism can be rotated until it is in edge contact with one or both of the columns (column 2, line 67-column 3, line 7). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to make the bed base disclosed by Takekoshi et al and Minis et al rotatable /movable between the two columns as taught by Kaufman et al in order to not obstruct access to the patient /patient image volume as taught by Kaufman et al (column 3, lines 48-67).

Regarding lines 11-15 of claim 1 and lines 12-14 of claim 6, which states that the bed is disposed at the side of the column with small cross sectional area or that the bed base extends longitudinally, respectively, with respect to a line perpendicular to both a line connecting the centers of the pair of columns and a line passing through the center of the pair of magnets; these limitations are considered inherent, since a MRI apparatus having the disclosed or modified structure is always going have a perpendicular line connecting the centers of the pair of columns as well as a line passing through the center of the pair of magnets, therefore when a bed is inserted between the two columns, closer to the smaller cross sectional area column, it is inevitable that the bed is inserted with respect to these two perpendicular lines. Kaufman et al discloses that bed can be closer to one column than the other (column 3, lines 2-6), therefore the apparatus formed when combining Takekoshi et al, Minas et al, and Kaufman et al discloses that the bed can be disposed at the side of the column with a small cross section area and with respect to the previously discussed perpendicular lines.

Regarding claims 5 and 10, the combination of Takekoshi et al and Minas et al does not teach that the direction of the line perpendicular to the line connecting the centers of the pair of columns and the line passing through the center of the pair of magnets intersects with a direction of the top plate insertion at an angle of 15 to 45 degrees or 25 to 35 degrees, respectively.

Kaufman et al teach that the direction of the line perpendicular to the line connecting the centers of the pair of columns and passing through the center of the pair of magnets intersects with the direction of the top plate insertion at an angle of 30 degrees (Fig 3B, 4B; column 5, lines 10-12). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to insert the table at an angle of 30 degrees in order to move the patient without losing the open unobstructed side access to the patient.

Regarding claim 7, Takekoshi et al discloses in figure 1, a bed fixing section (42) connected to a connecting section of the bed, wherein the bed fixing section (42) is disposed so that the top plate is inserted from a predetermined position toward the center of the magnets (column 3, lines 1-5), and the bed is fixed by connecting the connecting section of the bed with the bed fixing section (42).

Regarding claim 11, Takekoshi et al, Minas et al, and Kaufman et al disclose the MRI apparatus of claim 1 as stated above, wherein the bed is disposed at the side of the column with small cross sectional area such that a patient inserted with a head of the patient near the imagining volume can be accessed from both sides of a body of the

Art Unit: 2859

patient (see Kaufman et al, figures 3a, 3b, 4a, and 4b). As discussed above with respect to claims 1, 2, 6, and 9, the Takekoshi et al reference is modified by combining Minas et al, who teaches that one column has a smaller cross sectional area than the other, and Kaufman et al who teaches that the patient bed can be inserted anywhere between the two columns. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to dispose the bed closer to the column with the small cross sectional area in such a way that the head of the patient can be accessed on either side as taught by Kaufman et al in order to ensure easy access to the patient/patient's head.

3. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takekoshi et al (US 6215308) in view of Minas et al (US 2002/0145426) and Kaufman et al (US 5517121) as applied to claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 9-11 above, and further in view of Chari et al. (US 5436607).

The combination of Takekoshi et al, Minas et al, and Kaufman et al does not teach the pair of columns having a shape curved toward outside.

Chari et al disclose in figure 1, an open MRI magnet design in which the support (18) is bulged outward in the center (column 2, lines 48-49). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to apply this design feature of Chari et al to the support columns of Takekoshi et al, Minas et al, and Kaufman et al modified structure in order to provide better access to the imaging volume (Chari et al., column 2, lines 28-32).

4. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takekoshi et al (US 6215308) in view of Minas et al (US 2002/0145426) and Kaufman et al (US 5517121) as applied to claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 9-11 above, and further in view of Danby et al. (US 6828792).

The combination of Takekoshi et al, Minas et al, and Kaufman et al does not teach the pillar with small cross sectional area having a substantially rectangular cross section, and its longitudinal direction corresponding to the diameter direction of the magnet.

Danby et al. teach a support structure for an open MRI apparatus magnet (column 2, lines 14-35) wherein the support columns may be maintained at a required cross-sectional area without impairing access to the patient by making them rectangular in cross section with their longitudinal axis oriented in horizontal directions away from the pole axis (column 11, lines 17-28). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to apply this design principle of Danby et al to the support pillars of Takekoshi et al, Minas et al, and Kaufman et al's modified structure, in order to maintain sufficient cross sectional area to return the magnetic flux while avoiding obstructing access to the patient.

***Response to Arguments***



Art Unit: 2859

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 and 5-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure, **Yoshino et al (US 6812702)** discloses a MRI apparatus wherein the patient bed is rotatable about the apparatus, **Krogmann et al (US 6246239)** discloses a movable patient bed for use with MRI, and **Kamimura et al (US 7057389)** discloses a rotatable patient bed.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Megann E. Vaughn whose telephone number is 571-272-8927. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am- 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diego Gutierrez can be reached on 571-272-2245. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2859

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MEV  
Patent Examiner Art Unit 2859  
11/6/2006



Diego Gutierrez  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2800